



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the conflict with the weak, but that it first attains its *truly just nature* through *mutual concession*, through *compromise* with the weak. Since, however, such an adjustment would be made only in a moment when the powers of the opponents were equal, the "true right" first arises when the forces of the conflicting parties come into such a state of equilibrium; in other words, only when the weaker side is so far reinforced that the stronger is compelled to yield to a compromise. "Therefore," he says (p. 125), "not yet between the two sexes does there exist that entirely fair, noble, and worthy right which can only be the fruit of the conflict and adjustment of the claims (powers) of two equally strong parties." The author clearly shows the tendency to modify the proposition that might is the source and fountain-head of all right, to mean that right first develops to a "perfect right" when it secures *acknowledgment* at the hands of the originally weaker side.

In applying this theory to politics, he suggests the establishment of a "universal state," into which the *civilized* peoples of Europe, America and Asia (Japan and China) shall unite. In this "universal state," the "uncivilized" races should take a subordinate and not a free position; for "the civilized peoples must be the possessors and rulers of the whole earth." These views of the author give ample proof of his somewhat idealistic standpoint. I think that, from a realistic standpoint, one is compelled to dispute the possibility of a "universal state," within a calculable time, although it be but a federation of all "civilized peoples." For civilized peoples, too, are less likely to follow ideal than material interests, and the latter will not permit within a conceivable time the necessity of war to disappear even among the civilized. If the author had had the privilege of experiencing the war between Japan and China, he would perhaps have changed his views; he would perhaps have discovered that even between "civilized peoples" there are questions of might, and indeed thoroughly brutal, material questions of might, which cannot be answered otherwise than by war and desolation. In view of such gloomy necessities, every thought of a "universal state," consisting of the civilized peoples, is a dream of the idealist. However, this book by the Japanese scholar is at all events well worth reading because it is very stimulating.

LUDWIG GUMPLOWICZ.

[Translated from the German by ELLEN C. SEMPLE.]

Labour and the Popular Welfare. By W. H. MALLOCH. Pp. xi and 336. Price, \$2.00. London: Adam and Charles Black.

The object of this work "is to point out to the great body of the
[768]

people—that is to say, to the multitude of average men and women, whose incomes consist of the wages of ordinary labor—the conditions which determine the possibility of these incomes being increased, and so to enable them to distinguish the true means from the false, which they may themselves adopt with a view to obtaining this result” (p. 315). To accomplish the purpose thus cumbrously outlined, Mr. Malloch has divided his work into four books, which bear the following titles: (1) The divisible wealth of the United Kingdom; (2) the chief factor in the production of the national income; (3) an exposure of the confusion implied in socialistic thought as to the main agent in modern production; and (4) the reasonable hopes of labor—their magnitude and their basis. As these titles suggest, the book is more than a mere discussion of the share labor contributes to human welfare. It includes tolerably complete theories of production and distribution, a polemic against socialism and socialistic ideas generally, and, finally, a social forecast, which is, at the same time, the moral of the story. Mr. Malloch’s thesis, or, as an editorial writer in the *New York Nation* has it, “discovery,” is that, “whilst the immense majority of the population of this country [Great Britain] produce little more than one-third of the income, a body of men who are comparatively a mere handful actually produce little less than two-thirds of it.” The “immense majority” referred to are laborers who earn less than £150 a year, while the “mere handful” are the men of “ability” who earn more than this sum. The £150 is, of course, used more as an illustration than as a statement of the exact facts. The thesis is demonstrated by the following line of reasoning. To clear the ground, it is shown that a per capita distribution of the present national income would not change for the better, to any extent, the condition of the bulk of the laboring population. The rich would be despoiled to add a very small increment to the incomes of the poor. This claim, as an argument against reformers who propose to remedy social ills by a mere redistribution of social income, is familiar. It rests upon the assumption that such a redistribution of income, and the accompanying change in the character of the wants which will be able to command satisfaction, will not alter the productive power of society. This assumption is, of course, gratuitous. The present money income of society is but a crude measure of the satisfactions and pleasures society enjoys as a result of its industry, and this latter is the real *income* of society, about which we must think in comparing one social state with another social state.

Continuing, Mr. Malloch divides the factors in production into Land, Labor, Capital and Ability. Land, he attempts to show, is a factor of minor importance, because the gross rental of estates in

Great Britain is only one-thirteenth of the national income (p. 254). Capital is not itself productive, but owes its productivity entirely to the "ability" which directs it. Labor is, to be sure, capable of producing goods, but without the directing supervision of "ability" its product would be ridiculously small. This is shown by the fact that, "during the closing years of the last century, the population of Great Britain was about ten millions, and the national income about a hundred and forty million pounds" (p. 244), *i. e.*, the per capita productive power was fourteen pounds per annum. This, he assumes for the sake of argument, was due altogether to labor. "It is obvious that labor did not produce more, for no more was produced; and it is also obvious that if, since that time, it had never been assisted and never controlled by ability, the same amount of labor would produce no more" (p. 245). The present per capita income or productive power is thirty-two pounds (p. 29), or more than twice what it was one hundred years ago. This per capita addition of eighteen pounds, he believes, is to be ascribed altogether to the productive factor, "ability." It would require too much space to point out in detail the weaknesses in his argument. He believes, in the case of land, that rent is an accurate measure of the part it contributes to production, yet he admits that labor is able to encroach upon ability, and obtain more than it produces. May it not also encroach upon land? Is land, in the sense of agricultural land, the only other factor in production besides labor, ability and capital? What about natural forces? Because their contribution to the productive power of society is gratuitous, is no account to be taken of it, and is it to be boldly assumed that what crude labor does not produce must be ascribed to ability? But the capital fault of Mr. Malloch is to talk about labor and ability as if they were quite separate and distinct phenomena. In this industrial world there is no such thing as labor unassociated with ability. Even the roughest farmhand directs his efforts by his intelligence, and what he does differs only in degree from the task performed by the most accomplished railroad manager. And yet there is no objection to treating labor-force and intelligence as two distinct factors in production, and I, for one, agree with Mr. Malloch in regarding this as a desirable mode of classification. The objection arises only when labor-force is assumed to be the only contribution made by the laboring classes to the productive power of society. In other words, to assume that, because labor-force can be said to contribute only a certain amount to the income of society, *laborers* contribute only that amount, is as absurd as the other tacit assumption of Mr. Malloch that, because the combustible and heat-giving properties of certain forms of matter are familiar to every civilized human being, and can be utilized by each

one at a very slight expense, these properties do not contribute to the welfare of society except in proportion to the expense their utilization necessitates.

And yet, with all its faults of exaggeration and suppression, Mr. Malloch's book contains many suggestive ideas, and shows a mind not debauched by a too reverent study of the standard writers on political economy. There is a freshness about his manner of treating some aspects of the problems of production and distribution that makes even his reckless flinging of statistics palatable. For the rest, the tone of the book is exceedingly conservative, though the author's style is characteristically radical, and the conclusions arrived at for the guidance of the laboring class, to which the book appeals, are at once sympathetic and sound.

HENRY R. SEAGER.

University of Pennsylvania.

Soziale Kämpfe vor dreihundert Jahren. Von BRUNO SCHOENLAUBE.
Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1894.

So long as we still possess no comprehensive economic history, fragments are very welcome. We have a particularly valuable contribution to a future economic history in the present study by Schoenlaube. It leads us into the heart of the struggles which took place in mediæval Nuremberg between masters and journeymen, struggles which present a prelude to the present conflict between the proletariat and employers. The description of the condition of the crafts in Nuremberg is especially of great interest, because there were no guilds in that city and the craftsmen were subordinated to the municipal control, then in the hands of the merchant princes. The author shows us the different stages through which the journeyman-labor movement passed—the period of its early struggles, of its greatest success and of its decline. The town council of Nuremberg opposed the first efforts of the journeyman class to stand on their own feet and, by independent unions, to resist the oppressive economic ascendancy of their masters. Nevertheless, the movement grew stronger and stronger, and in the first half of the sixteenth century it reached its highest development. The journeyman organizations tried to regulate the working day, wages, and the adjustment of labor matters. The public authorities took steps against the movement, at first to no purpose, afterward only with the result that a compromise was effected, according to which the journeyman organizations were tolerated but were placed under a journeyman commission which was ratified by the police and supervised by the Town Council. The author tells in an intensely interesting manner how the social conditions in the